

World-Democracy and the Church

RT. REV. JOHN P. CARROLL, D.D.

An Address Delivered in the Cathedral of Seattle, Washington, Sunday, March 23, 1919.

PRESIDENT WILSON has repeatedly stated that the Great War was fought, not to strengthen any of the governments of the world, but to make free the peoples of the world—that its aim was to make the world safe for democracy. He also stated that self-determination for all nations, great and small, alike, should be granted by the Peace Conference and guaranteed by a League of Nations. The ideals of the President have been accepted by the Allies and the Central Powers, and all signs point to the establishment of democracy throughout the world.

The question has been asked, "How will the Catholic Church fare in the new world-democracy?" Some say the Catholic Church is the only remaining autocratic religion in the world, and that she is sure to disappear in the great cataclysm which is overwhelming all the autocratic governments of the world. This argument contains two statements: First, the Catholic Church is an autocracy; second, the Catholic Church cannot live or thrive in a democracy. Let us examine them.

Is the Catholic Church an autocratic religion? Autocracy, according to Webster, is independent, or self-derived power. An autocratic religion, therefore, is one that derives its power from itself, that is dependent on no source outside itself for its authority and the exercise thereof. Does the Catholic Church square with this definition? Let us look at the things that stand out most prominently in the Catholic Church:—her constitution, her mission, her doctrine, her morality. These are certainly not self-derived. They were given to her by Jesus Christ, her Divine Founder. It was He who said to Peter and through him, to his successors, the Popes of Christendom: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail

against it. And I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon the earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven . . . I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren. . . . Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." It was also Christ who said to the Apostles and, through them, to their successors, the Bishops of the Church: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature . . . Going therefore teach ye all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world . . . As the Father hath sent me I also send you . . . He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me. And he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me." The constitution, mission, doctrine and morality of the Church, outlined in these words, are, therefore, not self-derived. They are Divine. They come to the Church from God, through Jesus Christ, His Divine Son.

Let it not be objected that the people had nothing to do with their making. Religion is essentially from God. Man-made religion is a contradiction in terms. Religion is God's gift to the world—a gift by which man may be sanctified here and saved hereafter. Who shall say that the recipient, and not the giver, has the right to determine the conditions of the gift?

THE CHURCH'S DEMOCRACY.

But though the constitution, mission, doctrine and morality of the church are Divine in their source, in their human applications they are most democratic. The Founder of the Church and the Framer of her constitution, was indeed, the Son of God, but to establish His Church among men He, Himself, did not disdain to become a man, and that the Church might never forget its democratic origin He chose for His mother a lowly virgin, for His foster father a humble carpenter, and for most of His Apostles poor fishermen. The successors of the Apostles, the Bishops of His Church, though "appointed for men in the things that appertain to God," have never-

theless been "taken from among men," oftentimes from the poor and lowly. Pope Pius X was the son of the postmaster of Riesi, Cardinal Farley, of New York, was the son of a peasant, and the father of the great Archbishop Ireland was a carpenter. Hear what President Wilson has to say of the democracy of the Church, and of her Hierarchy and priesthood during the days when government was monarchical and aristocratic:

The only reason government did not suffer dry rot in the Middle Ages under the aristocratic system which then prevailed, was that so many of the men who were efficient instruments of government were drawn from the church; from that great religious body, which was then the only church, that body which is now distinguished from other religious bodies as the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church was then, as it is now, a great democracy. There was no peasant so humble that he might not become a priest, no priest so obscure that he might not become the Pope of Christendom, and every chancellery in Europe was ruled by these learned, trained and accomplished men, the priesthood of that great and dominant body. What kept government alive during the Middle Ages was this constant rise of the sap from the bottom, from the rank and file of the great body of the people through the free channels of the priesthood.

The mission of the Church is from God, but it is a mission to "all nations," "to every creature." The Church makes "no distinction between Jew and Greek, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, male and female. All are one with her in Christ Jesus." Before her altar King and peasant, governor and governed, learned and ignorant, white and black: all are equal. It is related of Chief Justice Taney, of the United States Supreme Court, that while awaiting his turn to go to confession one Saturday night in the Cathedral of Baltimore, a laboring man about to enter the confessional came down and said: "Take my place. It is not becoming that the Chief Justice should be kept waiting so long." Mr. Taney replied: "I am not Chief Justice here. I am only a criminal at the bar."

The doctrine of the Church is Divine, but it proclaims that all men have the same origin, the same destiny, that all are redeemed by the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and that all will appear on a footing of equality be-

fore the same dread tribunal to give an account of the deeds done in the flesh.

The morality of the Church is the eternal law of God written on the hearts and consciences of all men, and contained in the Decalogue promulgated by Moses and adopted by Jesus Christ; but it is a law which obliges all men without exception, the great as well as the little ones of the earth, the wise as well as the illiterate, the rich as well as the poor, the Pope and bishops and priests as well as the layman, the State as well as the individual. The moral code of the Church admits no double standard. It is founded on the democracy of the Ten Commandments.

THE CHURCH'S ADAPTABLE DISCIPLINE.

The discipline and legislation of the Church, though based on the immutable principles of dogma and morals, adapts itself to the genius of peoples, to their manners, customs and institutions and to the varying conditions of time and place. The celibacy of the clergy, modeled after Christ and His Apostles and by its example of moral heroism predisposing the world to the acceptance of the Gospel, has not always been enjoined, nor ever imposed on all parts of the Church. Marriage laws, while never losing sight of the unity, sanctity and indissolubility of Christian wedlock, have frequently been changed and are not the same in every country. Clandestinity, for example, made a diriment impediment by the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, was never enforced in all parts of the United States until Pius X issued the "*Ne Temere*" Decree, which went into effect in 1908. Likewise, laws of fasting and abstinence have not been the same always and everywhere. In a word, while refusing to yield one iota of the Divine deposit of faith and morals, the Church varies her discipline to suit the needs of the times and the temper of the people, remembering that her mission is to save the people, not to destroy them.

Finally, the government of the Church has many points of resemblance with our own republican form of government. The Pope, like the President, is elected. Bishops are appointed by the Pope, but only after the priests and bishops of the territory concerned are heard, just as

the
God
and
and
all
ittle
the
ests
ual.
ard.
nd-

ugh
als,
ers,
s of
fter
coral
the
osed
ver
of
are
ex-
of
all
Ne
ke-
the
us-
and
eds
ing
em.
nts
ern-
ops
and
as

Justices of the Supreme Court and Federal judges are appointed by the President, but not without the approval of the United States Senate. The Ecumenical Council, the supreme law-making body in the Church, made up of the Pope and the Bishops, resembles the American Congress, composed of delegates from the various States, with the President at their head. The Pope's college of Cardinals is like the President's Cabinet. The members of the Cabinet are the heads of various departments of the administration, just as the Cardinals in the Roman Curia are heads of the various Congregations which transact the business of the Universal Church. Every American citizen has access to the supreme tribunal at Washington. So the humblest child of the Church has the right of appeal to the highest court in Rome, and no question is decided until it has been given the fullest consideration. Whether we regard, therefore, its government and disciplinary legislation, or its constitution, mission, doctrine and morality in their human applications, we find that the Catholic Church, far from being an autocracy, is in fact a great religious democracy.

THE CHURCH THRIVES BEST IN A DEMOCRACY.

What about the second statement, namely, That the Catholic Church cannot live or thrive in a democracy? The Catholic Church can live under any form of government, because she carries in her hand the promise of her Divine Founder: "Teach all nations . . . And behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." Her life, therefore, is independent of all forms of government. Still she thrives best in a democracy.

The conditions most favorable to the growth and prosperity of the Church are freedom and peace, and these are more likely to be guaranteed in a democracy than under any other form of political rule. The Church lived and made converts during the 300 years of Roman persecution, but with the freedom granted by Constantine, she extended her conquests to the ends of the Roman Empire. Still peace was not complete under Roman domination. Peace presupposes order. St. Augustine defined it to be the tranquility of order. Order in civil government requires the presence of authority and liberty. In Rome there was authority, but no liberty. The au-

thority of the State was absolute, and thus absorbed the liberty of the individual. The doctrine of the Church regarding the dignity and rights of all men and their equality before God could not but create in time a feeling of unrest and a spirit of revolt against the absolutism of Roman authority. This disturbed the so-called "Roman Peace" and necessarily hampered the free action of the Church. Then came the Barbarians who destroyed the Empire and with it Roman autocratic power. But the Barbarians went to the other extreme. They, indeed, substituted individual liberty for the tyranny of Roman absolutism, but the spirit of liberty was too strong and it frequently degenerated into anarchy. Thus the order and peace of society was again disturbed. Pope Leo III restored authority to its rightful place when he revived the imperial dignity in the person of Charlemagne.

All the elements of a peaceful society were now present. The Emperor represented authority, the barons, or feudal lords, represented liberty, and the Church mediated between them. But the elements were not properly adjusted. The freedom of the barons was not extended to the peasants, burghers and serfs, who constituted the great mass of the people. Hence, according as their interest swayed them, the people united now with the barons against the Emperor, and now with the Emperor against the barons. Finally, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century the monarchy triumphed. Then came the so-called Reformation, which nationalizing religion made it the slave of the State, and thus weakened the only power which could successfully champion the liberties of the people. The old autocracy of the Roman Caesars, who arrogated to themselves the title of King and Pontiff, was brought back again to earth, an autocracy which the Church had banished from the world, an autocracy which was destined to haunt the political and religious peace of mankind until it was finally destroyed in the world's greatest war with the aid of the world's youngest and greatest Democracy.

AMERICA THE HAVEN OF THE PERSECUTED.

In the meantime Providence opened up a new world beyond the Atlantic which became the haven of the

down-trodden and persecuted peoples of Europe. These in time established a real democracy where authority and liberty are equally balanced. The people under God are the source of all political power. This they transmit to their rulers. But lest these should become despotic, a constitution defines the limits of their authority, and in case of dispute a court of final appeal interprets the Constitution. Liberty and authority are thus permanently safeguarded. Free from the age-long struggles of liberty against despotism and of authority against anarchy, the Church has enjoyed the peace necessary to work out her destiny. Is it any wonder that in less than 150 years she has made more progress in America than in any previous equal period of her history in any other country of the world? Now, if the democracy of America is going to be spread to all the peoples of the world, the Catholic Church may reasonably expect to duplicate in the world at large what she has accomplished in America. She has, therefore, nothing to fear from the new world-democracy. She welcomes it with radiant brow and a heart full of confidence.

But what kind of democracies lie in travail? That is the question which is filling with misgivings the members of the Peace Conference and statesmen and churchmen the world over. In countries where the old order has disappeared license and anarchy are showing their head. Bolshevism has overrun Russia, entered Poland and Germany and is appearing here and there, even in America. What is the remedy for this alarming condition of the new society? Some say "food for the starving and the unemployed." Some say "the strong hand of government" for the rebellious. What says the Catholic Church? *Justice!*

First of all, *international justice*—justice to all nations, great and small alike, justice to all nations, whether hostile or friendly during the late war. "Nationalities do not die," said Pope Benedict XV in one of his first public statements after his accession to the Chair of Peter, "and any attempt to crush a nation can only leave a legacy of hate which will be the

fruitful seed of future wars." "Just national aspirations must be respected," said he again when addressing the heads of States regarding the terms of peace. Finally, in his message to the American people last New Year's Eve, he made use of these solemn words:

On the eve of the New Year, in which humanity is at last to enjoy the blessings of peace, we are glad to send cordial greetings to the American people as the champions of those same principles which have been proclaimed both by President Wilson and the Holy See, insuring for the world justice, peace and Christian love. In this solemn moment, when a new era in the history of the world is about to begin, we pray that the Almighty may shed His light upon the delegates who are meeting in Paris to settle the fate of mankind, and especially upon President Wilson as the head of the noble nation, which has written such glorious pages in the annals of human progress. May the Conference be of such a nature as to remove any resentment, abolish forever wars among brothers, establish harmony and concord and promote useful labor. Out of the Peace Conference may there be born the League of Nations which, by abolishing conscription, will reduce armaments; which, by establishing international tribunals, will guarantee to every one independence and equality of rights.

If these admonitions are heeded, if this remedy of the Holy Father is accepted by the members of the Peace Conference, then will there be lasting peace among the new democracies of the world, because it will be founded on the solid rock of *international justice*. Secondly, if Bolshevism and anarchy would be banished from the new democracies, the Catholic Church teaches, there must be *social justice* within the nations affected.

THE CHARTER OF SOCIAL JUSTICE.

The great charter of social justice is the Decalogue, the Ten Commandments, which Our Lord reduced to the love of God and that of the neighbor. Bolshevism and anarchy, which are only Socialism carried to its logical conclusions, would eliminate all love, all authority, whether it find expression in God, the family, the Church, or the State, and make selfishness the law of life. Thus, the first four Commandments lose their binding force. Greed and pleasure then become the form of existence. Private ownership of the means

and instruments of production and distribution and even of land itself is condemned, and all property is transferred to the State for the use of the multitude. For this end "direct action" is advocated, and life and limb and reputation must not stand in the way. The Commandments, "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods," "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," are thus declared to be obsolete. Woman, likewise, becomes common property, family obligations cease and children are a charge on the State. Thus the Sixth and Ninth Commandments are stricken from the Decalogue. Authority, property, family gone, what is there to keep men from becoming a herd of brutes and red revolution from devastating the earth?

The prime remedy, therefore, for Bolshevism and anarchy is the observance of the Ten Commandments. Hence, there should be earnest inculcation of the love of God and the love of neighbor, the preaching in season and out of season of the Divine law, of the sacredness of authority, first of all, in God who is its source, then of authority in the home, the Church and the State, because it is from God, of the dignity of woman and the unity, sanctity and indissolubility of Christian Marriage, of the inviolability of private property. The Church preached these doctrines to the Barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire, and thus laid the foundations of Christian civilization throughout the length and breadth of Europe. By using all the energies of her great world-organization to bring these doctrines home to the minds and hearts of the newly liberated peoples she will stay the tide of Bolshevism and anarchy and direct the forces of democracy into the channels of true liberty, order and peace.

CAPITAL AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

But while the Church preaches the Commandments to the proletariat, she does not intend that capital shall be exempt from their observance. In fact, she feels that Bolshevism and anarchy, while often due

to the envy and cupidity of the workers which unscrupulous agitators have fanned into a flame, are nevertheless, not unfrequently traceable to the greed, injustice and cruelty of the rich and powerful. Leo XIII did not hesitate to say that "A number of very rich men had laid on the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself." And he further declared that "A remedy for this misery must be found, and found quickly, if society itself would be saved." He himself outlined the remedy in his famous Encyclical "On the Condition of Labor." That was nearly twenty-eight years ago. In the light of the developments which have since occurred in the industrial world, and particularly in the light of the conditions brought about by the late world-war, the Bishops of Germany, of Holland, of Ireland, of England, of the United States, have recently emphasized the remedy of Leo and laid down specific programs of social reconstruction. The program of the Bishops of the Catholic National War Council, of the United States, includes a legal minimum wage, which shall be sufficient for the decent maintenance of a family; insurance against sickness, accidents, unemployment and old age, to be a charge on industry until wages are raised sufficiently to become adequate for these purposes; maintenance of the war-scale of wages; labor participation in industrial management; co-partnership in industry; co-operative stores; abolition of profiteering and of child labor; equal pay for men and women; national and State aid in the solution of the unemployment problem; better housing.

In other words, the Bishops insist that the redressing of the just grievances of labor is necessary for the preservation of the present social order. The capitalist must remember that the laborer is a human being, not a mere instrument of production; that he is entitled to a living wage; that profit-making must be subordinated to the laborer's rights; that wealth is after all only stewardship.

To sum up: The Catholic Church holds that the nightmare of Bolshevism and anarchy cannot be

broken unless social justice prevail; and that social justice is impossible unless both employer and employed live up to the Ten Commandments. The spirit of religion and Christian morality, therefore, must be at the bottom of any scheme of social and economic betterment that would aim to make democracy safe for the world.

As America is leading in the peace settlement, so she must lead in the work of social reconstruction. And the Catholic Church in America, grown strong with the strength of democracy, must breathe her spirit and put her heart into the work America is striving to do. It is a turning point in the history of the world, and the Church in America would be false to her opportunity, false to her history, if she did not make use of it to lead men to a higher plane of Christian thinking and Christian living. Her Bishops are applying the old principles to the new conditions. Her laity must lend their time, their energy and their resources to carry out the directions of their spiritual leaders. The war was a holy crusade to win back liberty to the world. The Knights of Columbus played a high and noble part in helping America to achieve the glorious victory. Let their numbers be swelled, not only until they count one million, but until they include every Catholic layman in America. And may they be joined by their sisters of every Catholic organization in pushing to a glorious consummation the higher and nobler crusade of Christian social reconstruction.

Why the Catholic School Exists

R. J. LITTLE, S. J.

From the Brisbane "Daily Mail."

EDUCATION: What is it? Recently, in some remarks before the W. E. A. conference in Brisbane, I dealt with Catholic principles of education, and I would like to enlarge on the subject in the hope that these principles may be better understood. Your theory of life and your theory of education must go hand-in-hand. You may think you have no theory of education. But there is one tucked away in some cell of your brain, just because you must necessarily have a theory of life according to which you would like to live. The first question may be, how would you like to live if you had your own way? But, of course, the second question is, how would you like to have been educated for the life that you would like to live? For education is nothing less than a preparation for life. Catholics of course, as befits the inheritors of a great philosophic system, have a general theory of life into which each individual fits small improvements in detail for his own benefit. Well, this great philosophy gives forth certain fundamental doctrines, some of which have a very close relation to the education of children taken in its widest and less detailed sense. I will briefly enumerate some of them.

First, Catholics uphold strongly the principle that the State has a supreme and sovereign right to power in its own sphere, and I lay all the more stress on this fact because I am going to lay equal stress on other principles of ours which may seem to limit the exercise of State intervention. For we hold that there are other rights independent of the rights of the State. We hold even that the rights of the State and its rightful power have their origin in other rights which exist prior to the State and which would exist even if there was no State, no human law, nor any government yet established. These other rights are what I might call the fundamental private rights of individual men and of the family. On this subject I will only say here that a man has a right

against all others, including the State, to govern his own family.

We hold secondly that intellect and reason can get at truth, not only about the visible things around us, but about other things invisible and of an infinitely higher order. Thus we hold that intellect and reason starting from truths and facts admitted by common-sense, can follow out any line of reasoning to the bitter end, from conclusion to conclusion, from inference to inference, even if this course of legitimate inference leads us to invisible things, so high that we cannot fully understand their nature.

Thirdly, we hold that every intelligent child—and by intelligent child I mean any child of normal mind, any ordinary child—can easily follow the course of reasoning, although only in the most general outline, by which the human mind arrives at a sure and certain knowledge of a Supreme Ruler of nature and of conscience. Here, once more we believe that the child is stunted and starved in a supreme need of its intellectual and moral nature if it is deprived of this truth.

My fourth point is that we attach enormous importance to moral training, but only on one condition; that it be founded on the Christian notion of conscience. We hold that the child's conscience, like the grown person's conscience, is the ultimate human source of moral motive power. In other words, explain away the voice of conscience as the resultant of convention, habit, environment, heredity, self-hypnotism, self-worship, instinct for self-preservation or what not, then you are inevitably explaining away one of the essential elements of all moral motive power. D. Ketteler, the first leader of the German Christian Democratic movement, which has of late suffered an eclipse under the evil genius of a military class, always held that the development of a really Christian conscience in each man would go far to solve the social problem. It is clear to Catholics, at least, that all public morality, political or social, national or international, must depend ultimately on private personal morality. And also that this must depend on the sway of moral motives in the conscience of each person. Now, if the child is to be told that there is no inward witness,

no inward law imposed by an inward law-giver, and again that he or she has no responsibility to answer in secret to anyone but self, then we say you take from the child the only adequate idea of inward and moral obligation to love anything good which is displeasing to self, or to hate anything evil which is pleasing to self. At the very least we say common-sense will then tell the child that if self is the supreme and only master within, such a master is deprived of all the comfort and discomfort of feeling responsible to any other interior master.

The fifth characteristic which enters into our ideal of education is that we put the claims of the individual, and consequently of the family, not after, but before, the claims of the State. I might express the idea thus: The individual comes first, and it is for his or her advantage, whether as head of the family or a child in the family, that the family lives its normal life of family affections, joys, troubles, duties, independently of any outside person or authority. The Pope gives one instance of this in regard to the authority of the father, which, he says, has its origin in his nature as a self-respecting man, and can be neither abolished or absorbed by the State, and he adds for all these reasons that "It is a pernicious error to say that the civil government should, at its own option, interfere in or intrude intimately into a normally well-conducted family." I will only point out here that this is true of the school also, because we regard school life as a continuation of family life. But, of course, this does not mean that the State may not help the parents to have the kind of school required for the good of the children, and give every other help consistent with the predominance of the family spirit.

THE PLACE OF SCIENCE.

My sixth point has reference to the place of science in education. Here I announce a truism which ought not to need any emphasis, namely, that science should be kept in its place; in other words, it should be kept strictly within the sphere of science. So-called scientific theories are frequently not science at all, but just unverified theories about all life and the universe. Popular writers on these theories—I have one before my mind at present, Mr.

Joseph McCabe—write for the masses about Huxley and Haeckel as if these authorities always spoke as men of science, whereas they themselves admit that they spoke with one voice when addressing science students in professional lectures and quite another voice when expressing general theories for unscientific audiences. Thus, in his biographical lectures, Huxley's biography tells us he did not in the least mean to say that one species turned into another to develop thereafter a third; he simply meant "that the characters of the second are intermediate between the two others." In other words, he did not teach the genetic evolution theory at all. Being questioned on this striking fact by Father Hahn, S.J., who attended his lectures, Huxley answered that in his lectures to students he had time to put the facts before a trained audience, but that in his public lectures "he passed over the facts rapidly and put forward his personal convictions." He says elsewhere: "By next Friday evening my working-men will be all convinced that they are monkeys," and so on.

My seventh point is that we attach great importance to the development of a spirit of faith in the young, that is to say, of a faith founded on reason as opposed to anything like blind faith. I suppose we can all understand the importance of human faith and its proper development in children, and why this human faith, namely, the accepting of someone else's conclusions in matters which you cannot investigate for yourself, is an absolute necessity at every turn in intellectual as well as in practical life; and also, I suppose, we all understand that this faith should always be founded on reason and common-sense, or else it becomes worship of a mere hero, as in the cases just referred to, hero-worship run mad. But many people do not understand that the Catholic theory of education insists on the absurdity of any act of faith which is not equally founded upon reason and common-sense in regard to the claims of anyone, no matter how sacred, who comes along to demand our acceptance of his word. All faith, religious or not, must be sane and founded on reason.

My eighth point comes here, for it is in the way of faith, as just described that, for the Catholic world at

least, Christ has so powerfully entered into the lives and thoughts of Christians. As Professor Fairbairn says: "It is not Jesus of Nazareth" (as a mere man) "who has so powerfully entered into history; it is the deified Christ" (Christ as God) "who has been believed, loved, and obeyed as Saviour of the world." So in this eighth point I lay emphasis on one great fact: that this faith in Christ and in what He has revealed makes all the difference to us in our inmost thoughts, in our whole outlook on things of the mind as well as those of practical life. In spite of human inconsistencies and weaknesses, of which we have as big a share as other men, Catholics value this faith so much that they are quite resolved to have their children inherit it in all possible features. For this reason they make great sacrifices in order to support schools in which secular learning is to be given of the very best possible quality and quantity, but all transfused, as far as possible, by this spirit of faith.

On Killing the Wounded

From the Bombay "Examiner."

A "MILITARY CHAPLAIN" sent Father Hull the following letter and had his doubts cleared up in the subjoined article:

In defending outposts of the Empire, our soldiers are often engaged with savage frontier tribes, who invariably torture, mutilate and kill prisoners of war. There is a general feeling in military circles that it is in keeping with the noblest instinct of humanity, mercifully to put an end to wounded comrades, who are in danger of being taken alive. Also, it is felt that self-destruction is justifiable and better than having to face the certain prospect of a cruel and lingering death. What should be the attitude of Catholic soldiers under these circumstances?

Sorry to say the thing cannot be allowed. The teaching of the Church is unequivocal, that God is the supreme master of life and death; and that no human being is allowed to usurp His dominion so as deliberately to put an end to life, either his own or anyone else's without an authorization or delegation of God, either direct or indirect, expressed or implied.

The Church recognizes this kind of authorization or delegation in certain instances, especially in the Old Testament: (1) In specific and individual cases, as for instance the command to Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac, or where God ordered Saul to "utterly destroy Amalec," and so on. (2) In case of certain crimes, as where God attached a death penalty to adultery, etc., in the Mosaic law. (3) Where God instructs the Chosen People to wage certain wars against their enemies. Apart from explicit authorization, the Church also interprets the law of nature as allowing the act of killing: (1) To a nation engaged in a just war. (2) The execution of criminals by the Government. (3) The killing of an unjust aggressor by the innocent individual in self-defense.

But the Church never has allowed, and never will allow, the killing of individuals on the grounds of private expediency: for instance to escape torture or mutilation; or to put an end to prolonged suffering or

hopeless sickness; or to rid the community of decayed and useless members who are a burden to themselves and to others. The modern outsider often looks upon this prohibition as very unpractical and also very inhumane. They say: It would be a positive mercy to the sufferer and to everybody else to put this or that wretch out of his pain; and the sufferer himself would in many cases be glad of it.

The argument is plausible enough, and it is not the only instance of the kind. Take for example divorce. There are cases on which the maintenance of the marriage-bond is a source of life-long misery, to which divorce would at once put an end. There are cases in which divorce would not only be a relief and benefit to the two parties, but it would also be free from all evil or injurious consequences to any third party. And yet even in the single clear case, the Church sticks inexorably to its principle: "A Christian marriage [we put aside the more complex case of non-Christian marriage] is a life-long bond soluble only by death"—and there is an end of it. It may be "hard lines" in a particular case. But the hard lines must be accepted as part of the inevitable, and made the best of.

It may be difficult to find any convincing intrinsic reason why these rigid doctrines should be maintained as admitting of no exception. But there is at least one indirect reason which, when stated clearly, can hardly be gainsaid. If the Church did once relax the rigor of the universal law by allowing divorce under certain distressful circumstances, the effect would be disastrous to the whole system. The human mind, once given an opening, would take appalling advantage of it. As soon as divorce looms on the horizon, the foundations of the stability of marriage are shaken. Every quarrel, or disagreement, or feeling of weariness will at once suggest the idea of separation. Every illicit attraction felt for another person will be indulged in with impunity, on the ground that if the new *liaison* "comes off," the old marriage-bond need not stand in the way. The mere fact that the marriage-bond is soluble at option will make married people far

less careful to keep up their affection and agreeableness with their partners. The occasions justifying divorce will be multiplied; and designing people will actually lay themselves out to create those occasions in order to secure their liberty to separate and marry elsewhere.

In much the same way, as soon as a case of prolonged suffering occurred, immediately the thought of *euthanasia* would also arise as a feasible means of escape. The victim of the suffering would merely have to feel "This is intolerable" and he would be tempted to add "I had better make away with myself, or get somebody else to do so." Nurses would fall under the temptation of quietly smothering an agonizing patient with a pillow. Burdened relations would begin to think of doing the same. The practice of killing the wounded in fires, in railway collisions and in war would come into vogue. The same principle would next be applied to mental troubles. Suicide would become an ordinary refuge for the distressed or dependent, and all conscience about the solemn sacredness of life would disappear.

A French philosopher once said "If there were no God we should have to invent one" in order to keep the vicious inclinations of humanity in check. In the same way we might say "If the Catholic doctrine regarding the sacredness of life and of the marriage-bond did not exist, we should have to invent it," in order to keep life and marriage safe from the inroads of laxity and ruin. The very fact that a departure from the strict principles of the Church at once opens the doors to wholesale and widespread disorder is not altogether a *direct* proof of the truth of the Catholic position. But it is at least a very persuasive argument, which tends to show that the constitution of humanity itself requires such absolute restraining laws; and that therefore the laws themselves must be founded in the nature of things, and belong to the natural law as stamped by God on the world.

The Church's Grandeur

MAX PEMBERTON.

TAKING into consideration the peoples of Europe and of the Western Hemisphere, the Catholic Church has more members and communicants than any other church in the world. It reaches into more by-ways and upon more highways than any other religious organization. Be it hamlet or be it hovel the Catholic priest or the Catholic missionary is upon the scene to discover and save the soul. The Catholic Church is in closer touch and in more frequent communication with its members than any, and has the means of searching the conscience as has no other religious organization. There lies within it the opportunity for guiding wavering spirits and raising the fallen to the point of rectitude and honor more intimately than any other religious institution. There is a comprehensiveness about the Catholic Church that seems to make its influence felt in the most all pervading manner. It recognizes not only its duty toward the well-being of its own communicants, but it recognizes that it has an obligation toward the well-being of all the people because of its influence upon the happiness of its own members, and thus it pours forth most universally its beneficent influence. The Church stands for things which not only make for civilization, but stands for the development and endurance of civilization itself.

It has been said that the Catholic Church is wont to keep its communicants in ignorance, and that it only holds sway through the ignorance of its communicants. I have had association with members of the Catholic Church, from the lowliest communicant to the highest member of the Hierarchy at Rome, and I can say with all confidence and with great earnestness that no charge is more unjust and no accusation more calumniating than to say that the Catholic Church keeps its communicants in ignorance, or that it thrives upon ignorance. It stands for education; it stands for enlightenment; it stands for that which makes the highest in man.